

DTIC FILE COPY

(4)

DPSYCH-N
R/N 1/90

AR-005-840

The Royal Australian Navy
Officer Retention Survey

AD-A220 269

The Effects of Age, Educational Level and Branch
Membership upon the Attitudes of Male RAN Officers

Part 1
Within Branches

by

R.G. SALAS

Area Psychologist

Melbourne

DTIC
ELECTE
APR 10 1990

S
E
D

(C) Commonwealth of Australia
January 1990

APPROVED

90 04 10 094 FOR PUBLIC RELEASE

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA

1a. A R Number 005-840	1b. Establishment Number DPSYCH-N R/N 1/90	2. Document Date JANUARY 1990	3. Task Number
4. Title The Effects of Age, Educational Level and Branch Membership on Officer Attitudes		5. Security Classification (Place appropriate classification in box/s ie Secret(S), Confidential(C), Restricted (R), Unclassified (U)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> document <input type="checkbox"/> title <input type="checkbox"/> abstract	6. No. Pages
8. Author(s) R.G. SALAS Area Psychologist (Navy) Box XYZ GPO Melbourne, VIC 3001 Australia		7. No. Refs	
10. Corporate Author and Address DPSYCH-NAVY Russell Offices Canberra ACT 2600 Australia		9. Downgrading/Delimiting Instructions	
		11. Office/Position responsible for - Sponsor...DPSYCH-N..... Security...DPSYCH-N..... Downgrading..... Approval.....	
12. Secondary Distribution (Of this document) Approved for public release Overseas enquiries outside stated limitations should be referred through ASDIS, Defence Information Services Branch, Department of Defence, Campbell Park, CANBERRA, ACT 2601			
13a. This document may be announced in catalogues and awareness services available to... Unlimited			
13b. Citation for other purposes (ie. casual announcement) may be <input type="checkbox"/> unrestricted or <input type="checkbox"/> as for 13a			
14. Descriptors Officer Retention Survey Age, Educational and Branch Effects Officer Attitudes.		15. COSATI Group	
16. Abstract The results of previous research suggested that possession of tertiary educational qualifications modifies officer attitudes towards the Service. The results of the present analysis confirmed that such effects can be partially attributable to age and to branch membership. Attitudes of younger, tertiary qualified officers towards the Navy are likely to be more volatile than those of their age-peers who do not possess a tertiary level of education. Members of the Executive branch however appear to be comparatively immune from these influences. It was argued that the potential marketability in civilian life of the particular tertiary qualification held may play some part in the generation of officer attitudes towards the Services. Some reflections on Australian military attitude surveys are included. <i>Keywords: Officer Retention Surveys (KR)</i>			

Page Classification

This page is to be used to record information which is required by the Establishment for its own use but which will not be added to the DISTIS data unless specifically requested.

16. Abstract <i>(Contd)</i>		
17. Imprint		
18. Document Series and Number	19. Cost Code	20. Type of Report and Period Covered
21. Computer Programs Used		
22. Establishment File Ref(s)		
23. Additional Information <i>(As required)</i>		

Table of Contents

	Page
Foreword	
Introduction	1
Background	2
Part 1. Age effects Procedure	2
Results	3
Part 11. Age and education effects Procedure and Results	6
Conclusions and Comment	7
Part 111. Branch Effects Procedure and Results	9
Summary	14
Conclusions	16
Argument	18
Some Reflections on Military Survey Reporting	19
References	
Appendix A The Officer Retention Survey Questionnaire	
Appendix B Brief description of the Scales	

FOREWORD

The comparisons between groups discussed here are made on the basis of average or mean scoring differences for those groups. Even when statistically significant, these mean differences are often not particularly substantive nor do they necessarily represent opposing positions. They more often represent only differences in degree of subscription to a particular proposition or degree of endorsement of a particular view.

Earlier research results, for example, have shown massive support for the concept of mid-career management education within the RAN Officer Corps. The results of later analyses which show differences in the mean subscription to this concept by branch are differences in relative degrees of favourability only. They do not necessarily imply a negative position versus a positive position in such a case.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



Introduction

In a recent analysis an association was suggested between an officer's level of academic qualifications (secondary or tertiary) and some of his attitudes towards the Service. (Salas, 1989).

In particular, members of the branches which call for a greater tertiary requirement (the Engineer and Instructor branches) were noted to be significantly more dissatisfied with Navy management than were members of the Executive or Supply branches. (ibid)

In a subsequent communication the Head of the Royal Australian Navy Officers' Career Study team* commented thus

"This result could have significant implications for the future as increasingly more officers of all branches acquire tertiary qualifications at an early stage of their careers." He went on to point out that the ROCS Team had already noted "a tendency among young Supply officers with Economics, Commerce or Accounting degrees to be dissatisfied with career management and prospects of meaningful employment." It was suggested that the apparent disenchantment of degree holding officers might have been due, with Engineering and Instructor officers, to them "having greater expectations (whether valid or not) which have not been met by Navy".**.

Presumably, similar trends could become apparent as more Executive branch officers in particular, gain tertiary qualifications. The aim of the present study is to attempt to identify the focal effect, if any, of educational level upon the attitudes of serving, male RAN officers.

* Commodore D.B. Chalmers, RAN

** Letter to the present writer from CDRE Chalmers. (ROCS 200/89 of 16 November 1989)

Background

Unpublished total sample results from the Retention Survey indicate that the possession of higher level educational qualifications by male RAN officers tends to be a function of age. Younger officers (<age 30) are significantly more likely to possess tertiary educational qualifications than are older officers.

In another analysis attitudes towards the Navy of tertiary educated officers were compared with those of officers who had secondary education only. An age effect was very obvious in the results which made it unsafe to conclude that the mean attitude differences seen were due to education level alone.

It is evident that the apparent effect upon the attitudes of serving RAN officers towards Navy management by variables such as academic qualifications might well be moderated by an age effect.

Are the attitudes of those who are tertiary educated due to their age or to their possession of academic degrees, or to both?

Part 1

Procedure

In order to highlight age effects the total Retention Survey sample was divided into two sub-samples, one comprising male officers of <30 years of age (n = 481) and those who were older (n = 836). Mean item# and Scale* scores were compared for the subsamples using t as a test of the significance of differences revealed.

see Retention Survey questionnaire at Annex A

* see Annex B for brief description of the Scales

Results

Significant differences in Scaled attitudes between these two age sub-samples appeared on the Commitment, Career Prospects, Job Satisfaction and Resignation Propensity Scales as follows: ($p = .01$)

- a. Younger officers were significantly less committed to the Navy
- b. They had significantly higher career motivation
- c. They were significantly less affected by family concerns
- d. They saw their career prospects as being significantly brighter
- e. They were significantly less satisfied with their jobs but were
- f. significantly less resignation prone

..... than older officers.

In terms of individual item level satisfactions and dissatisfactions with Service life, younger officers were significantly less satisfied with the chances to show their talents provided by the Navy, were less keen to make the Navy their career, were more dissatisfied with their current Navy job and felt that their expectations of Navy life have been met to a much lesser extent than was reported by older officers. (Section 4, items 1 to 10) However they were more satisfied with promotion chances, felt that they were doing better in the Navy than they could in civilian life and were more satisfied with their Navy pay.

In addition younger officers reported that they were significantly less satisfied with their Navy career to date, were less satisfied that they chose Navy over other careers available and in general had less emotional commitment to the Navy including lesser feelings of obligation than did older officers. (Section 4, items 11 to 16).

Younger officers were much less attracted to the concept of mid career management education than were older officers to a very high level of statistical significance ($t = 7.10$, $p = .000$; Section 2, item 4) younger officers reported themselves as being more properly trained for their present job than did older officers to a high degree of statistical significance ($t = 2.9$, $p = .004$). Younger officers were significantly more dissatisfied than were older officers with the current (1987) officer personal reporting system ($p = .025$; Section 2, item 8) and regarded the Dream Sheet system as being more effective than did older officers to a highly significant degree (0.001) (Section 2, item 10).

There was no statistically significant mean difference between the attitudes of older and the younger groups towards Navy management and officer career planning (Section 2, item 9).

The table below summarizes the attitude differences discussed above. Most of them appear to represent genuine, age-linked phenomena some of which have been reported earlier (Salas 1987).

Attitude Differences. Older and Younger Officers Compared. All Branches.

Younger Officers
(< 30 years)

Less committed to the Service
Less affected by family concerns
More career motivation
Better career prospects seen
Less keen on Navy career
More satisfied of promotion chances
Lower resignation propensity
Feel doing better in Navy than
civilian life
More satisfied with Navy pay
Expectations not met as well
Much less keen on mid career education
More report proper job training
More satisfied with Dream Sheet
More just thinking about resignation

Older Officers
(> 30 years)

More committed to Service
Lesser career prospects seen
Less career motivation
More affected by family concerns
More satisfied with current job.
Higher resignation propensity
More emotional committment
Less satisfied with pay
Less satisfied with promotion
chances
Expectations met better
More keen on Navy career
Less proper job training reported
Much more keen on mid career
education
More actively pondering resignation
Feel doing less well than could
do in civilian life

Part 11

Procedure

The two subsamples described above (≤ 30 years and > 30 years of age) were sub-divided again on the basis of a respondent's possession or lack of possession of tertiary level educational qualifications. This resulted in the following groups.

AGE	ANALYSIS
-----	----------

Group 1 ≤ 30 years of age	secondary (n = 185) vs tertiary (n = 295)
--------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

Group 2 > 30 years of age	secondary (n = 533) vs tertiary (n = 301)
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------------

Mean item and Scale score differences were tested for significance using the t statistic.

Results. Group 1 - younger officers (≤ 30 years)

Significant mean Scale score differentials ($p < 0.01$)

Those RAN officers with tertiary qualifications in this age group tended to be

- a. less generally satisfied with Navy life (SQ)
- b. less committed to a Navy career (CS)
- c. less satisfied with their job situations (JOBSAT)
- d. less emotionally committed to the Navy as an organization (KS)

- e. possessed of higher level of resignation propensity (RP)
 - f. possessed of a lower level of career motivation (CMS)
 - g. more certain of obtaining civilian employment without much trouble (JOBEST)
 - h. less affected by family concerns (FF)
- than those with secondary level education only.

Group 2 Older officers (>30 years)

Significant mean Scale score differences ($p = < .01$)

Those RAN officers with tertiary qualifications in this age group tended to be,

- a. less career motivated (CMS)
 - b. more certain of obtaining a civilian job without much trouble (JOBEST)
-than those with secondary level educational qualifications.

CONCLUSIONS

Attitudes towards the Service and a Service career amongst younger officers (age < 30 years) appeared to be strongly moderated by the possession or non-possession of tertiary level educational qualifications.

This moderating effect was not nearly so evident amongst older officers (age > 30 years).

I

I

L

S

P

A

L

2019年12月10日
 2019年12月10日

1. 17-03-04 19

L L

L L

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

their joining expectations had been met to a lesser degree than that reported by officers of other branches at the same career stage. (Salas, 1989, p.19)

In the light of these results it may be premature to assign too definite a role for the phenomenon of unfulfilled expectations. It is to be concluded at this stage that the existence of unfulfilled expectations is probably a function of age rather than educational level with some isolated branch effects a possibility.

ATTITUDES TOWARDS NAVY MANAGEMENT. (Section 2, items 8, 9 & 10)

In the analysis by age alone, older officers tended to regard the Dream Sheet as being significantly less effective than did younger officers ($t = 3.2$, $p = .001$).

This phenomenon disappeared when the older group was subdivided on the basis of educational level. Older degree holders tended to be significantly less satisfied with Navy personnel management than were their lesser educated age peers ($t = 2.01$, $p = .009$). There were no differences between degreed and non-degreed younger officers on this topic.

To investigate possible focal effects of this result branch membership was included in the analysis.

Part 111

BRANCH EFFECTS

A moderator of officer attitudes towards the Navy has been found to be branch membership (Salas, 1989). An analysis within branches was carried out in the present context to test for this influence.

Procedure

Male members of the Executive, Engineer, Supply and Instructor branches were divided into younger (≤ 30 years) and older (> 30 years) subsamples. These subsamples were further subdivided on the basis of the possession or not of tertiary educational qualifications. Mean scale and item score differences were tested for significance using the t statistic.

RESULTS

EXECUTIVE BRANCH.

(1) Younger Officers (≤ 30 years)

Secondary (n = 127) vs Tertiary (n = 152)

- a. There were no significant Scale score differentials detected between those on tertiary and those on secondary levels of education. (SQ, CS, CMS, FF, CP, JOBSAT, RP, JOBEST, KS: see Annex B)
- b. There were no significant mean item score differences between the tertiary and the secondary subgroups on any of the ten items of the Scale of Satisfaction with Naval Life (SQ, Section 4, items 1 to 10)
- c. There were no significant mean item score differentials on any of the six items measuring commitment to the Navy between the secondary or the tertiary level educational subgroups. (CS, Section 4, items 11 to 16)
- d. There were no significant differences between the two groups in attitudes towards management (Section 2, items 8 to 10).

- e. Younger, tertiary educated Executive branch officers were very significantly less attracted to the concept of mid-career management education than were their counterparts educated to the secondary level only. (Section 2, item 4).
- f. There were no statistically significant mean differences between the educational groups regarding their perceptions about being properly trained for their present jobs. (Section 2, item 4)
- g. There was no statistically significant mean difference between the educational groups regarding their satisfaction with Navy management (Section 2, items 8, 9, & 10).

EXECUTIVE BRANCH (continued)

- (2) Older Officers (>30 years)

Secondary (n = 342) vs Tertiary (n = 61)

- a. There were no significant mean score differences on any of the Scales between those on the tertiary and the secondary levels of education. (SQ, CS, CMS, FF, CP, JOBSAT, RP, JOBEST, KS)
- b. There were no significant mean score differences on any of the 10 items comprising the Scale of Satisfaction with Naval Life between the tertiary and the secondary educational groups (SQ Section 4, items 1 to 10).
- c. There were no significant mean score differences on any of the six items comprising the Commitment Scale (Section 4, items 11 to 16) between the secondary and the tertiary educational sub-groups.

- d. There were no significant, mean, attitude differentials between the subgroups regarding Navy management. (Section 2, items 8 to 10).

ENGINEERING BRANCH

- (1) Young Officers (< 30 years)

Secondary (n = 3) vs Tertiary (n = 66)

Only three members of this subsample signified possession of non-tertiary educational qualifications. The application of parametric statistical techniques was not permissible.

- (2) Older Officers (> 30 years)

Secondary (n = 950) vs Tertiary (n = 111)

- a. There were no significant mean score differentials on any of the Scales between those on tertiary and those on secondary levels of education.
- b. There were several significant mean score differences between items on the Scale of Satisfaction with Naval Life. (SQ, Section 4, items 1 to 10) as follows
- i Tertiary educated, older Engineering branch officers were more satisfied with their chances of promotion to a highly significant extent over those with secondary qualifications (Section 4, item 5)

- ii Tertiary educated, older Engineering officers report to a significant degree that they feel that they are not doing better in the Navy than they could in civilian life than do secondary educated officers (Section 4, item 6).
 - iii The older, tertiary educated Engineering officer was significantly more satisfied with his job (Section 4, item 9) than was one with lesser qualifications and he tended to be more satisfied than those in the secondary education group with the opportunities provided for him to exercise his talents. Section 4, item 2).
- c. Those in the older, tertiary educated Engineering group reported that they had been more properly trained for their present job to a highly significant degree when compared to their counterparts with a secondary level of education only. (Section 2, item 7)
- d. The difference in attitudes towards the concept of mid career management education found here between the two educational groups in this age group was not statistically significant. (Section 2, item 4).
- e. No significant differences between educational groups in this age group was detected on the items reflecting attitudes to management (Section 2, items 8, 9 & 10).

COMMENT

Most of the differentials cited above are in a positive direction.

SUPPLY BRANCH

(a) Younger Officers (those aged 30 years and below) ($p < 0.01$)

Secondary (n = 50) vs Tertiary (n = 42)

Younger Supply branch officers with tertiary educational qualifications differed from their less qualified counterparts on the following Scales and items.

1. They were significantly less satisfied with Naval life. (SQ)
2. They were significantly less committed to the Navy and a Navy career. (CS)
3. They reported significantly less job satisfaction. (JOBSAT)
4. They were significantly less emotionally committed to the Service (KS)
5. They were significantly less keen to make the Navy their career (Section 4, item 4)
6. More reported that they were properly trained for their present job (Section 2, item 7).
7. They reported less interest in the concept of mid-career management education (Section 2, item 4)
.....than those with secondary qualifications only.

Comment Nearly all the above differentials are negatively oriented

(b) Older Supply Officers (those older than 30 years)

Secondary (n = 63) vs Tertiary (n = 20)

Officers in this group who possessed tertiary degrees differed from their lesser educated age peers on the following Scales and items.

1. They were significantly more satisfied with their general remuneration position (RS) but were specifically more dissatisfied with their Service pay (Section 4, item 8).
2. They were liable to be significantly more affected by family influences. (FF)
3. There were no significant differences between the educational groups regarding attitudes towards the concept of mid-career management education (Section 2, item 4) or on their perceptions of being properly trained for their present job. (Section 2, item 7)
4. In this age group there were no significant differences between the tertiary and the secondary groups on attitudes towards Navy management (Section 2, items 8, 9, and 10).

INSTRUCTOR BRANCH

All members of this branch must possess appropriate tertiary educational qualifications as an entry requirement. The present analysis by differential educational levels within branches therefore cannot apply to the Instructor branch..

COMMENT

Because of the nature of the branches only older Engineering branch officers and no Instructor branch officers at all were available for the present interactional analysis by branch, age and educational level. Therefore only the Executive and Supply branches could be treated fully in this manner. The Executive branch is by far the biggest branch, representing nearly 50% of RAN trained officer strength, and inferring from the comments of the Head of the ROCS team (see above) its attitudinal disposition is one of traditional moment to Navy Office.

Despite the foreboding tone of some of the ROCS team comments however, it appears that the Executive branch, as it stood at the time of the Retention Survey in 1987, was relatively immune to the volatile combination of young age levels and the possession of tertiary educational qualifications. On the other hand younger degree holders amongst the Supply branch officers show attitudes which substantiate the observations of the ROCS team. (see Introduction above). Possession of the degree by those officers is seen to be a likely explanation of this phenomenon.

From what we saw of the Engineering branch, older Engineers with degrees do appear to possess statistically significant differential attitudes towards the Service than do those without degrees but with the exception of one topic (not doing as well in the Navy as in civilian life) all the attitude differentials were in a positive direction.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The influence of educational level upon the attitudes of the Executive branch appears to be minimal. It appears to affect attitudes towards mid-career management education only. Those with degrees are less attracted to this concept.

2. Observations made on young, degree holding, Supply branch officers by the ROCS team members appear to be confirmed by the present results. These officers appear to possess dissatisfied, negative attitudes towards the Service of a generalized, global nature.
3. Degree holding, older Engineering officers appear to have generally more positive attitudes towards the Service than their branch counterparts who do not possess degrees.
4. The conjectured role of unfulfilled expectations in the generation of negative attitudes towards the Navy was not supported in the present results.
5. Despite the extremely high overall popularity of the concept of mid career management education amongst all Navy officers it is clear from the present results that those who hold degrees are likely to be relatively less attracted than those who do not have degrees.
6. Officer Corp attitudes towards management, never very positive, (Salas 1987), do not appear to be influenced by educational level, at least within the Executive and Supply branches according to the results of the present analysis which, it must be recalled, is devoid of representation from young Engineers and Instructors of any age.

INSTRUCTORS AND YOUNG ENGINEERS

The results of previous between-branch analyses by career stage (Salas, 1989) suggested that members of the Engineering and Instructor branches as a general rule tended to be more negative in their attitudes towards Navy management than were Supply or Executive officers.

Since the attitudes of younger, degree holding Supply officers possessed generalized negative, more volatile attitudes towards Navy it could be hypothesised that the attitudes of young Engineers and Instructors might exhibit similar volatility (the reasoning for this is outlined below under ARGUMENT).

This could be tested for by comparing the attitudes of young graduate officers of all four branches at risk. This analysis is in train.

ARGUMENT

The potential of branch membership and the possession of tertiary educational qualifications for influencing general attitudes towards the Navy should be pondered further.

In the case of Engineers and Instructors the degree virtually defines the branch. This is reflected in the entry requirement and later employment. A degree or equivalent tertiary qualifications is not a prerequisite for entry into or membership of the Executive or Supply branches except in the case of officer cadets at the Australian Defence Force Academy or full time undergraduates on other Navy sponsored degree courses.

Whether a degree was obtained after joining or as a pre-requisite for entry into a branch does not seem to be as critical to the possession of certain attitudes towards the Service as does the category of degree possessed. This is based on the marketability of the particular qualification in civilian life, or if you like, its general utility. On this basis those with Engineering, Teaching or Commerce/Accounting qualifications can plug in immediately to civilian employment virtually as they stand. Degrees in this category can be seen as meal tickets and the careers they lead to exist independently of the Service. It seems inevitable then that this will result in a different mind-set amongst the officers who possess such qualifications than that which appears to prevail amongst Executive branch members who possess the not so readily marketable Arts and Science degrees

This categorization by degree marketability receives some support from the results of an earlier analysis. Serving Engineers and Instructor officers consistently responded more positively to the following Retention Survey questionnaire item than did Executive officers or Supply branch officers.

At present how certain do you feel that you could get satisfactory employment in civilian life without much trouble?

Very certain Fairly certain Uncertain Not applicable (Section 3, item 8)

Across their whole career spectrum Executive branch officers consistently reported comparatively less certainty in obtaining civilian employment than did members of the Engineer and Instructor branches. (Salas, 1989).

At any rate, the circumstance of being able to more or less precisely relate their tertiary qualifications and therefore potential employability to a civilian reference group may allow Engineer, Instructor and Supply branch officers freer play to appraise their Naval careers in a more objective and critical fashion. Those in the Executive branch, in contrast, appear to incorporate their tertiary qualifications into their image as career Naval officers resulting in the maintainance of their primary and exclusive Service orientation.

WHAT THE SOCIOLOGISTS MIGHT SAY

Sociologists are likely to label Executive officers as being "institutionally" oriented.

Attitudes of officers with an "institutional" self-image, by definition are based on a belief in the values and goals of the organization and involve feelings of duty and obligation. They tend to accept hardship and disappointments without losing faith and have a tendency to place the welfare and aims of the Service before their own.

Members of the Engineering, Instructor and Supply branches would be seen as being "occupationally" oriented.

Attitudes of Service officers with an "occupational" self-image tend to have the civilian world as their main reference group. Their self-image is based on the social and economic standards of this reference group and they tend to place their personal goals before the aims and the welfare of the Service. They tend to query Service values and functioning from a more detached, rational, unemotional viewpoint in appraising their career prospects.

Extreme examples of "occupationally" oriented officers would be hard to find in any Service. When pondering career options they would probably find the general military ethos incompatible with their own self-image and would look elsewhere. On the other hand extreme examples of "institutional" types are likely to be attracted to the military.

However, mixed, overlapping types of orientation must exist and these would outnumber the extremes of either type. To restate the concern of the Head of the ROCS team regarding the likely contaminating effect of the possession of degrees upon the attitudes of members of the Executive branch, the issue appears to centre, in sociological terms, upon the probability of the "institutional", emotional values of Executive officers becoming transformed into the relatively more rational, "occupational" orientation towards the Service at a rate paralleling the rising incidence of tertiary qualifications within that branch. Concern about this transformation is shared by military sociologists. Some regard it as inevitable in the military at large. Others are not so sure.

However the results of the present analysis provides initial evidence which suggests that rising educational levels within the Executive branch of the RAN may not be accompanied, necessarily, by a corresponding erosion of the basic "institutional" orientation of members of that branch.

The threat to the Executive branch of invasion by the more rational, civilian-oriented attitudes typical of the occupational stereotype may be non-existent or minimal at most. In actual fact, according to the present results, the reverse might be occurring. They demonstrate an apparent growth of institutional values, within the three branches studied here, with increasing age and duration of contact with the Navy.

This phenomenon is typified by the attitudes of older degree holding Supply officers. These are far less critical or negative and more settled and accepting of the Service than those of their younger branch counterparts. Older Engineering officers also appeared relatively settled in their attitudes.

It may be concluded that the attitudes and values of young tertiary qualified Supply officers are about what is to be expected given an "occupational" frame of reference and that attitudes of Executive branch officers, young or old, tertiary or otherwise qualified, are about what one would expect of officers who seem to be primarily "institutional" in their orientation to the Navy.

Furthermore, the particular role and employment, (and deployment) of Executive branch officers is not unlikely to be a prime factor in the maintenance of this orientation, degrees or no degrees. Additionally to suggest that the longer the duration of contact with the Service the greater the degree of institutionalization of attitudes which ensues, whatever the branch membership, may not be too much of a truism. The more individual "occupational" orientation may well be function of youth.

CONCLUSIONS

The result of the series of micro-analyses of the data yielded by the RAN Officer Retention Survey and reported in this and the previous publications

in this series by the present writer should illustrate the limitations inherent in the results of initial generalized, broad brush analyses of personnel survey data.

Future surveys of military personnel should test for and control, if indicated, for the moderating effects of such variables as age, branch or corps, educational level, and possibly career stage, resignation propensity, satisfaction levels and (other rank) re-engagement intentions to ensure that reliable results are available for the sponsor.

A REVIEW OF MILITARY PERSONNEL SURVEY RESEARCH

The present writer has now conducted a series on some fourteen or so published analyses of data resulting from the Royal Australian Navy Officer Retention Survey which was completed in 1987. More unpublished analyses have been performed and further analysis remains still to be done and reported upon. A review of the survey and resultant publications in this series leads one to a number of conclusions.

1. Analysis of the data resulting from attitude surveys of military personnel, officers in particular, cannot hope to provide reliable results (and therefore value for money) unless they recognize the potential influence of major variables such as sex, age, branch or Corps, educational level, and possibly career stage and resignation propensity and control for them. When this has occurred in the present series of analyses, some theories and speculations were discounted and the focus of some casually observed influences upon officer attitudes resolved more clearly.
2. Analyses of the results of attitude surveys of military personnel which fail to control for the above and other appropriate variables are likely to prove inadequate and superficial. They would tend to present an impressionistic, broad brush, average sort of picture which would fail to reveal focal, high intensity hotspots of feelings and associated intentions and possibly behaviour.
3. The use of correlational and more advanced statistical techniques of analysis can on occasion obscure as much as it appears to reveal when the results are served up to a non-psychological sponsor as likely evidence of the existence of certain effects.

Take the following instance. The product moment correlation coefficient between the degree of actively pondering resignation (Section 3, item 2) and satisfaction with Navy career management (Section 2, item 9)

is 0.25, a result which was highly significant statistically but one whose utility (practical value) is not only far from compelling but no indication of the directionality of causation can be inferred. (What causes what?) In a subsequent simplistic analysis controlling for age, career stage, location and resignation pondering it was found that the extent of negative attitudes towards the DNOP function reached an extreme focal point amongst younger, more resignation prone officers. 80% of these had negative attitudes towards their Navy career management, an unheard of proportion. (With the inclusion of older, resignation-prone officers dissatisfaction rates fell to 75%).

"Such is the extent of this phenomenon amongst those pondering resignation that it can be concluded likely that these attitudes are implicated in the actual resignation behaviour of these individuals." (Salas, 1987, p.6).

The requirement for working through data resulting from military personnel surveys in a systematic attempt to eliminate superficial and possibly misleading impressions by substituting fine grained analytically based, more reliable results cannot be overstated.

Initial, broad-brush impressionistic treatment of attitude survey results do have a use. They clear the ground and set the stage for subsequent, more intensive micro-analyses which are more likely to produce reliable results of greater possible utility. Regrettably, but perhaps inevitably, even routinely, the requirements of military sponsors of applied personnel attitude research nearly always stop short at a "final report" based on the first macro-sweep through the data stockpile by the principal researcher. There are reasons for this, but nevertheless, this is the usual model.

4. Projects tend to lose visibility and momentum and to slow down dramatically after the data gathering stage is completed due to the requirements for data processing and analyses and production of a bound report, especially if only one principal researcher is involved.
5. The 1987 RAN Officer Retention Survey did not follow this paradigm. By agreement twelve copies of the original frequency run, with tables suitably modified by the application of stick-on labels were issued to the sponsors (the Director of Naval Personnel and the Director of Naval Officer Postings) and other Directors in the Personnel Branch.

Requests for fresh analytic runs followed fairly soon after this. The results of these were communicated first by letter to the particular "client" and later reported through a published Research Note which made them more generally available.

As noted over fourteen bound reports were published serially based on the survey results. There never was any "final" report. The closest to this appears in Salas (1988).

This method of communicating the results of personnel analyses to non-psychologist sponsors could be considered unique. It was partly a response to the scarcity of research resources in the RAN Psychology Branch but mainly to the positive attitudes of the sponsors.

There seems to be something to be said for contact between the sponsor and raw analytic data. Frequencies and significance levels are fairly readily understood by most officers, given an initial explanatory label or two. The full range of item scoring frequencies, means etc are visible and the loose, printout renders movement between items of interest a less tiresome task. At any rate, this technique of reporting provided the opportunities for the generation of hypotheses by the sponsor and request for clarifying data runs on particular subsamples. Hence the series of Research Notes.

The momentum of the project was thus preserved for longer than is usually found when one employs the traditional "report and forget" model.

The data base has since been more or less continuously accessed via the present writer, by Defence Committees, Parliamentary Committees and Agencies eg the recent series of requests from the RAN ROCS Team.

At times when requests flagged, the present writer generated his own hypotheses, tested them and reported the results. As noted earlier however, much more still remains to be done with the Retention Survey data before its timeliness decays.

It is not envisaged that other military personnel surveyors will attempt to abandon the familiar "report and forget" routine in favour of the less tidy but more interesting and potentially more productive method used in the 1987 Navy Retention Survey. Sponsors are usually actuated by pressures from elsewhere and answers are desired ASAP. Rarely in the writer's experience, if ever, does a follow-up inquiry attend the issue of the "final report".

This lack of follow-up queries may not just indicate the sponsor's relief at the arrival of the expert's answer. Sponsors might appear to think "That's all there is", or they may be reluctant or diffident about stringing the project out for any number of reasons even if they do generate a few private hypotheses from the reported results. The prospect of the sponsor becoming involved in a dialogue with the researcher, even if through intermediaries, is not common.

Final reports can only follow more refined and hypothesis-ridden analyses which would hopefully include hypotheses generated by the sponsor and/or his associates. There is not an officer around of whatever rank who has not some personal view of the problems of the Officer Corps, if not the entire Service. These views, expressed in varying degrees of sophistication,

represent nothing less than grass-roots hypotheses and some of them can be taken very seriously indeed. Therefore the sponsor should be persuaded somehow into becoming more closely involved with the project.

Hypotheses are not always explicated in any detail by non-psychological sponsors of large scale surveys. General terms of reference are usually available but occasionally the surveyor is presented with a broad statement of the problem eg "I have the impression that morale is not good" or "Why is the officer resignation rate so high?"

Faced with the task of designing a survey questionnaire capable of establishing an appropriate data base without benefit of any pilot run (often the case) it is a virtual necessity for the surveyor to obtain grass-roots hypotheses, formal and informal, from a variety of sources within the survey population at risk. In the case of the Retention Survey a mini-avalanche of responses resulted from this action. Many of these were prime material upon which questionnaire items were based.

The next occasion where resort to grass-roots hypotheses is indicated is after the first report of the initial data analysis is issued in whatever form. Nearly always these results raise as many questions as they aim to answer. However, as noted earlier, the formal "report and forget" paradigm tends not to encourage feedback to try for an answer to some of these questions.

The relatively informal presentation of the results of the first frequency sweep through the data from Retention Survey, described above, provides some food for thought in this regard.

If future military attitude surveyors were able to negotiate feedback of the survey results along the lines described above not only would sponsors be in receipt of wanted output at a much earlier stage than is usual but requests for further micro-analyses, probably involving grass-roots hypotheses would be enabled, particularly if the principal researcher

indicated that he was holding himself and the data on standby for such requests. (This also tends to help preserve some of the original momentum of the project).

The formal "report and forget" model tends to close off these sponsor options by not soliciting them. Not only is the sponsor thus short-changed but the report writer frequently expresses frustration, usually expressed in the classical ending "Much more research is required to....". Rarely is this option picked up, incidentally.

In terms of actual reporting it has not gone unnoticed by the present writer that military sponsors of research in the Services are often hungry for early results. Provision of this in the shape of a three or four page executive summary can relieve mounting pressures on both parties.

As an additional bonus the executive summary provided in the Retention Survey was later circulated by the sponsor to all RAN officers in fulfillment of a promise to this effect made when the Survey was first launched.

SUMMARY

The "report and forget" model of communicating the results of survey analyses to non-psychologists should be changed so as to extract greater value from the scarce research dollar. This can be achieved by providing for fuller, more hypotheses-guided analyses of the hard won survey data.

A prerequisite for this appears to be a greater involvement in the project by the sponsor than is normally seen in a Service setting, especially if only one principal researcher is involved.

It is acknowledged that the suggestions made above will appeal to few researchers in the ADF psychology services. However two reasons impelled the present writer to address the topic. These are clear enough already but will be restated.

One is to ensure that the sponsor gets more value for money. This is only likely to occur if it is made clear to the sponsor that he can go on asking questions if he wants to after the initial report appears.

The second is to meet the sponsor's requirement for early results as quickly as possible and in the mode most easily assimilated by him, all within the constraints of good professional reporting practice.

REFERENCES

1. Salas, R.G., An Analysis of Attitudes towards Officer Career and Personnel Management by Age, Career Stage and Resignation Propensity. Research Note 8/87. Issued by Area Psychologist, Department of Defence (Navy Office), Melbourne, Victoria. November 1987.
2. Salas, R.G., Measurement of Resignation Propensity. A Descriptive Analysis. Part 1. Scale Construction. Research Note 6/87. Issued by Area Psychologist, Department of Defence (Navy Office, Melbourne, Victoria. March 1988.
3. Salas, R.G., The Affects of Career Stage and Branch Membership upon the Attitudes of Serving RAN Officers. Research Note 4/89. Issued by Area Psychologist, Department of Defence (Navy Office), Melbourne, Victoria. November 1989.

Naval Officers Survey

STAFF-IN-CONFIDENCE
(WHEN COMPLETED)

The information contained in this form will be used for statistical purposes only and the author's anonymity will be preserved. To answer the questions please colour in the circle next to the appropriate choice.
(e.g. If you are a male your answer to Question 3 would read -- 3. Sex: Male ☒ Female ☐)

If the question involves giving numbers, letters or dates please write the characters in the boxes above each column then colour the appropriate response position underneath. Some questions ask for written comments and submissions. Please write responses to these questions in the space provided on the last page (Section 6).
USE ONLY PENCIL TO MARK THE RESPONSE POSITIONS. RUB OUT ANY ERRORS AND REMARK

SECTION 1

1. Service Number :

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

2. Surname :

A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H
I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J
K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K
L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q
R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

3. Sex : Male ☐

Female ☐

4. Date of Birth:

DAY	MONTH	YR
	JAN	<input type="radio"/> 19
	FEB	<input type="radio"/>
00	MAR	<input type="radio"/> 00
01	APR	<input type="radio"/> 01
02	MAY	<input type="radio"/> 02
03	JUN	<input type="radio"/> 03
04	JUL	<input type="radio"/> 04
05	AUG	<input type="radio"/> 05
06	SEP	<input type="radio"/> 06
07	OCT	<input type="radio"/> 07
08	NOV	<input type="radio"/> 08
09	DEC	<input type="radio"/> 09

5. Date joined R.A.N.

DAY	MONTH	YR
	JAN	<input type="radio"/> 19
	FEB	<input type="radio"/>
00	MAR	<input type="radio"/> 00
01	APR	<input type="radio"/> 01
02	MAY	<input type="radio"/> 02
03	JUN	<input type="radio"/> 03
04	JUL	<input type="radio"/> 04
05	AUG	<input type="radio"/> 05
06	SEP	<input type="radio"/> 06
07	OCT	<input type="radio"/> 07
08	NOV	<input type="radio"/> 08
09	DEC	<input type="radio"/> 09

6. Time (yrs) since last promotion.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

7. Age now (yrs and months)

Years									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Months									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

8. Length of continuous service (yrs)

6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

9. Length of time in current posting. (months)

0	16	8
12	24	30 +

10. Branch

Executive.....	<input type="radio"/>
Engineer.....	<input type="radio"/>
Supply.....	<input type="radio"/>
Instructor.....	<input type="radio"/>
Health Services.....	<input type="radio"/>
Other.....	<input type="radio"/>

11. List

GL.....	<input type="radio"/>
SD.....	<input type="radio"/>
SL.....	<input type="radio"/>
SS.....	<input type="radio"/>
RL.....	<input type="radio"/>
Other.....	<input type="radio"/>

12. Substantive Rank

SBLT.....	<input type="radio"/>
LEUT.....	<input type="radio"/>
LCDR.....	<input type="radio"/>
CMDR.....	<input type="radio"/>
CAPT.....	<input type="radio"/>

13. On which list were you initially commissioned?

GL.....	<input type="radio"/>
SL.....	<input type="radio"/>
SD.....	<input type="radio"/>
IT.....	<input type="radio"/>
Other.....	<input type="radio"/>

14. Current Job

Sea <input type="radio"/>	Shore <input type="radio"/>
---------------------------	-----------------------------

15. Highest Academic Qualification

Secondary.....	<input type="radio"/>
Tertiary.....	<input type="radio"/>

16. Marital Status

Single.....	<input type="radio"/>
Married.....	<input type="radio"/>
Other.....	<input type="radio"/>

17. Number and Age of Children

No children.....	<input type="radio"/>
Children 0 - 5 yrs.....	<input type="radio"/>
Children 6 - 12 yrs.....	<input type="radio"/>
Children 13 - 18 yrs.....	<input type="radio"/>
Children 19 + yrs.....	<input type="radio"/>

18. Do you 'have' your own house?

Yes.....	<input type="radio"/>
No.....	<input type="radio"/>

If you answered 'No' do not complete Item 19.

19. Are you now living in your own house?

Yes.....	<input type="radio"/>
No.....	<input type="radio"/>

20. Have you ever lost money on house sales or purchases, house financing/refinancing including mortgage difficulties directly due to Service reasons?

Often.....	<input type="radio"/>
Sometimes.....	<input type="radio"/>
Never.....	<input type="radio"/>
Not Applicable.....	<input type="radio"/>

Posting and Course Preferences.

For the next three questions, indicate your first FIVE preferences by marking the appropriate number next to your choice. For example, if your first location preference is Jervis Bay mark the 1 next to it, but if it is your fifth preference then you would mark the 5 response position.

Please mark only 5 preferences in each question and for Question 21, please also indicate your Present Posting.

21. Location Preference.

Present Posting

Sydney Area.....	<input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Nowra.....	<input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Jervis Bay.....	<input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Canberra Area.....	<input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Melbourne Area.....	<input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Westernport.....	<input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Perth Area.....	<input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
North West Cape.....	<input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Adelaide Area.....	<input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5

Present Posting	
Brisbane.....	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Cairns.....	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Darwin Area.....	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Hobar.....	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Overseas.....	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5

22. Posting Preferences

Present posting	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Officers Trng	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Sailors Training	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Exchange	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Sea Going	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Joint Staff	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
- Minor Unit	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Trng Devol.	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
- Major Unit	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Trng Qual	
Staff - Ops (Gen)	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Control	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Staff - Manpower	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Staff - Ops	
Supply Mgt	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	(Intel)	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
CDSC/SWSC	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Staff - Project	
ILS	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Mgt	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
UVW Med	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Flying	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Est Med Staff	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Pers Fin Mgt	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Fire Protection	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Movement/Tpt	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Recruiting	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Hospital	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Test Flying	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Security	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Dockyard	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	EDP	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Cash Duties	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Submarine	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Secretarial	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Flying Instructor	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Stores	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Overseeing	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5

23. Courses Desired

Single Service		Joint Service Staff	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Staff	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Ships Diving	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Language	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Hydrography	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
MCD	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Meteorology	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Oceanography	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	PWO (C)	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
PWO (ASW)	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	PWO (G)	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
PWO (D)	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	APWO	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
PWO (N)	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Submarine	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
AIC	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Observer	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Pilot	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	QHI	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
QFI	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Post Graduate	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Test Pilot	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	F/T Civ School	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
ILS	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	LEDC/Fit	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Project Mgt	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	U W Med	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
EDP	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	RAF Aero	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Joint Serv NBC	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Systems	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
NAVIC	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Trng - Admin	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5
Trng -		Trng - Qual	
Anal/Design	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5	Control	<input type="radio"/> 1 2 3 4 5

SECTION 2

1. Officers have expressed the observation that there are comparatively few billets at future rank levels which have much interest in them. This implies posting an officer to positions for which he/she is not a volunteer. How does, or will, this situation apply to you?

Very much ☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all

Please write in Section 6 any feasible solutions you may have for the above problem.

2. An unofficial suggestion has been made that members be given access to whole or part of their long service money when it becomes due. Some thousands of dollars would be involved. What is your reaction to this idea?

Extremely favourable..... ☐
 Highly favourable..... ☐
 Favourable..... ☐
 Unsure..... ☐
 Not favourable..... ☐

3. How frequently are you frustrated at the lack of decision making opportunities (including the signing of correspondence, signals and documents) for one of your rank level?

Continually..... ☐
 Frequently..... ☐
 Sometimes..... ☐
 Never..... ☐

4. How are you attracted to the concept of Mid Career Management Education for those officers who not have a previous opportunity for obtaining degree qualifications?

Very strongly..... ☐
 Strongly..... ☐
 Mildly..... ☐
 Uncertain..... ☐
 Not attracted..... ☐
 Against it..... ☐

5. What is your estimation of the level of esteem in which the RAN is held by the civilian population at present?

Very high..... ☐
 High..... ☐
 Uncertain..... ☐
 Low..... ☐
 Very low..... ☐

7. Have you been properly trained for your present job?

Yes, fully ☐ Yes, partially ☐
 Not really trained ☐ Not applicable ☐

Reporting

8. How satisfied are you with the current RAN Officer Personal Reporting System?

Very satisfied ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Most unsatisfied

9. How satisfied are you with the quality of the RAN Personnel Management (including Officer Career Planning)?

Satisfied ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Most unsatisfied

10. How effective do you think is the dream sheet system?

Very effective ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Useless

SECTION 3

RESIGNATION

1. Have you ever considered resigning?

Yes.....○
No.....○

If you answered 'Yes', please specify in Section 6 when and for what reason you changed your mind on that/those occasion(s).

2. At present, how actively are you considering resignation?

Very actively ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Not considering it at all.

Note: The next three questions are to be only answered by those who answered ⑥, ⑦ or ⑤ to Question 2. Others please go to Question 6.

3. Please give an estimated time frame in which your contemplated resignation is most likely to be implemented.

0-2 mths ○ 3-6 mths ○ 7-12 mths ○
13-18 mths ○ 19-30 mths ○ 30 + mths ○

4. Is there any chance that your proposed resignation could be averted or deferred?

No chance.....○
Could be deferred.....○
Could be averted.....○
Not sure.....○

5. What action, within reason, do you consider that the Navy (DNOP) could take, in your case, to either avert or defer your proposed resignation? Please answer in Section 6.

6. Numbers of resigning officers express concern at what they describe as the erosion of benefits and conditions of service. Show the extent of your agreement with this assertion as a possible resignation factor in your case.

Very strongly agree ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Very strongly disagree.

Civilian Employment

7. Have you had one or more job offers from organizations or individuals outside the Service over the past 2 years?

No.....○
One.....○
2 or 3.....○

8. At present how certain do you feel that you could get satisfactory employment in civilian life without much trouble?

Very certain.....○
Fairly certain.....○
Uncertain.....○
Not Applicable.....○

9. Have you actively initiated enquiries about one or more employment prospects outside of the Service over the past two years?

No.....○
Yes, one.....○
Yes, 2 or 3.....○
Yes, more than 3.....○

If you answered Yes above, what triggered these off? (explain briefly in Section 6)

10. How many of these were related directly to your Navy employment?

N/A.....○
None.....○
One.....○
Some.....○
Most.....○
All.....○

11. How attractive does the idea of career employment in civilian life appear to you at present?

Very attractive ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Not sure Very unattractive

12. Would you leave the Service without a job to go to upon resignation?

Yes.....○
No.....○
Maybe.....○

13. What kind of civil employment would you prefer on discharge?

- Self employment..... ☐
Public Service..... ☐
Private enterprise..... ☐
Don't know..... ☐

14. Required income from any prospective civil job.

- Not applicable..... ☐
Less than 50% of current gross salary..... ☐
50%-90% of current gross salary..... ☐
90%-110% of current gross salary..... ☐
More than 110% of current gross salary..... ☐

15. How does your Navy pay (allowances, benefits etc.) compare with the money you think you could expect to receive in civilian life?

Much better ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Much worse

Return of Service Obligation (ROSO)

To be completed by those officers currently serving under a ROSO

16. How long was the period of the ROSO which you incurred?

1yr ☐ 1 to 2 yrs ☐ More than 2 yrs ☐

17. From today, how long will it be before your ROSO terminates?

Less than 1yr ☐ 1 to 2 yrs ☐ More than 2 yrs ☐

18. What are your likely intentions following the termination of your ROSO?

- Resign..... ☐
Not sure..... ☐
Make a Navy career..... ☐

19. How committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy career?

- Not committed at all..... ☐
Some commitment..... ☐
Very committed..... ☐

Spouse's Employment/Education

20. Does your spouse currently, or usually work at paid employment?

- Yes..... ☐
No..... ☐
Sometimes..... ☐
Not applicable..... ☐

If you answered Yes or Sometimes to the item above please answer Questions 21 and 22.

21. Would your spouse's employment be

- Full-time..... ☐
Part-time..... ☐
Home based..... ☐
Own business..... ☐
Other..... ☐

22. Mark any of the following statements which apply as reasons for your spouse being employed:

- to help maintain family living standards..... ☐
to help improve family living standards..... ☐
to fund specific activities or projects such as ☐
(mark as many as apply)
children's education including their cultural and sporting pursuits..... ☐
spouse's own education/career efforts..... ☐
home buying activities..... ☐
car buying..... ☐
family vacation /leisure projects..... ☐
to maintain previous skills..... ☐
post- Service family objectives..... ☐
other..... ☐
for something to do..... ☐
other..... ☐

23. Is your spouse enrolled in any study courses which require her/his attendance at lectures etc?

- Yes..... ☐
No..... ☐
Not applicable..... ☐

If so, please answer the following

24. Is the study

- Full-time..... ☐
Part-time..... ☐

25. Level of study

- Tertiary academic..... ☐
TAFE certificate..... ☐
Secondary..... ☐
Other..... ☐

26. Have you ever been concerned that your children may be exposed, on occasion, to a variety of social/ideological beliefs held by their school teachers?

- Yes, often..... ☐
Occasionally..... ☐
Never..... ☐
Not applicable..... ☐

27. To what extent have you and/or your family been the victims of what is termed "crisis management"?

- Often..... ☐
Sometimes..... ☐
Never..... ☐
Not Applicable..... ☐

28. If so, how traumatic has this been to all concerned?

- Very traumatic..... ☐
Upsetting..... ☐
Mildly upsetting..... ☐
Non traumatic..... ☐
Not applicable..... ☐

SECTION 4

Below is a list of questions on how you feel about the Navy. Read each statement and mark your answer by filling in the response that indicates how you feel one way or the other.

1. How well do you think the Navy is run?

Very well ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Very badly

2. What sort of chance does the Navy give you to show what you can do?

A very good chance ⑦⑥⑤④③②① A very poor chance

3. In general, how do you feel about life in the Navy?

Very satisfied ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Very dissatisfied.

4. How do you feel about making the Navy your career?

Very keen to. ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Don't want to

5. How do you feel about your chances of promotion in the Navy?

Satisfied ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Dissatisfied.

6. Do you feel in general that you are doing better in the Navy than you could in civilian life?

Very much better ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Very much worse

7. Do you think you have improved and bettered yourself by being in the Navy?

Very much so ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Not at all

8. How satisfied are you with your Navy pay?

Very satisfied ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Very dissatisfied.

9. How do you feel with your current Navy job?

Very satisfied ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Very dissatisfied.

10. Men and women coming into the Navy expect things from their future Navy life. How well would you say that your expectations have been met?

Much better than expected ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Much worse than expected.

11. At present, how committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy career?

Very committed ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Not committed at all

12. How satisfied are you with your Navy career to date?

Very satisfied ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Very dissatisfied.

13. How satisfied are you that you chose to join the Navy over other careers available?

Very satisfied ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Very dissatisfied.

14. I find that my values and Navy values are very similar

Strongly agree ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Strongly disagree

15. Navy membership has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

Strongly agree ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Strongly disagree

16. How strong is your sense of obligation to the Navy?

Very strong ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Non existent

SECTION 5

REASONS FOR RESIGNATION

Please examine the statements below and indicate by marking the appropriate response position, how much influence each of these factors might contribute to your decision to resign from the RAN.
(Note: Single Officers are to ignore items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.)

Key

- A. No influence on decision.
- B. Some influence on decision
- C. Moderate influence on decision
- D. Great influence on decision.
- E. Most influence on decision

	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
1. Effects of posting turbulence on spouse's education.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
2. Effects of posting turbulence on spouse's employment.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
3. Effects of posting turbulence on marital harmony.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
4. Effects of posting turbulence on children's education.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
(if applicable)					
5. Spouse's attitude to your RAN service.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
6. Desire to live in one location.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
7. Desire to obtain DFRDB benefits.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
8. Uncertainty about future policy on DFRDB benefits.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
9. Promotion expectations unlikely to be met.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
10. Unattractiveness of likely future posting locations or jobs.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
11. Non-use or misuse of your professional skills.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
12. Desire to try your talents in a civilian environment.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
13. Belief that you cannot achieve any further significant contribution to RAN.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
14. Frustration with efforts to achieve perceived RAN objectives within current defence organizational system.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
15. Attraction of higher income out of RAN.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
16. Dissatisfaction with RAN housing scheme.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
17. Financial costs of being in RAN (eg. removals).....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
18. The special problems associated with marriage to another Officer.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
<u>Female Officers only.</u>					
19. Pregnancy.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
20. Have offspring and can't mix child rearing with a Navy career.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
21. Consider amount of maternity leave is inadequate.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
22. Posting with spouse/partner is impossible.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
23. Restricted career options because of limitations placed on the employment of Service women.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
24. Frustrated with having to cope with traditional male Service attitude towards females.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
25. Have married or intend marrying a non-commissioned serviceman and am concerned about the Service's attitude to this.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
<u>For All Officers</u>					
26. Any other reason (please specify).....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
.....					
.....					

SECTION 6

Today's Date.....

Please write down your responses to the following questions relating to matters raised in the previous Sections.. This Section will be detached and treated separately. Your name is not required, only your

1. Age 2. Sex and 3. Length of Service.....
4. Do you have any solutions to the problem of posting Officers to billets in which they have no interest?
(Refer Section 2, Q.1).....
.....
.....
.....
5. Which of your particular skills do you feel that the Navy may have under-used or mis-used?
.....
.....
.....
6. At your present career point what would constitute for you, an unattractive posting?
.....
.....
7. For those not committed, what are the main general factors prohibiting you making the R.A.N. a permanent career?
.....
.....
.....
8. If you have ever considered resigning when and for what reason did you change your mind on that/those occasion(s)?
(Refer Section 3, Q1).....
.....
.....
9. If you are actively considering resignation, what action do you consider that the Navy (DNOP) could take, in your case, to either avert or defer your proposed resignation?(Refer Section 3, Q.5).....
.....
.....
10. If you have made any inquiries about civilian employment prospects within the last year or so what triggered these off? (Refer Section 3, Q.9).....
.....
.....
11. Please specify any particular personal or domestic effects caused by "posting turbulence" in your case.
.....
.....
.....
12. Please specify any particular dissatisfaction you may have or have had with financial conditions of Service.
.....
.....

Thank you for your Co-operation

11651

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SCALES

CAREER MOTIVATION

As noted above, the Career Motivation Scale (CMS) measures the extent of the desire to continue serving.

The scale is comprised of the following items from the Retention Survey Questionnaire. The Section and item numbers follow in parentheses.

1. At present how actively are you considering resignation? (S3Q2)
2. Please give an estimated time-frame in which your contemplated resignation is most likely to be implemented. (S3Q3)
3. At present, how certain do you feel that you could get satisfactory employment in civilian life without much trouble? (S3Q8)
4. Have you actively initiated enquiries about one or more employment prospects outside the Service over the past 2 years? (S3Q9)
5. How many of these enquiries were related to your Navy employment? (S3Q10)

N.B. For this scale, the items were keyed so that a high score indicated a low level of motivation to continue serving and vice-versa. This should be remembered when interpreting Tabled data.

The CMS proved to be unifactorial with a reliability coefficient (alpha) of 0.71. This is a satisfactory result and one which could probably be improved upon. All items were generated by the present writer.

NAVY COMMITMENT SCALE

The following six items were included in the Retention Survey Questionnaire with the aim of measuring officer commitment to a Naval career.

Commitment Scale items - Retention Survey (Section 4)

	Item
At present, how committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy career?	(11)
How satisfied are you with your Navy career to date?	(12)
How satisfied are you that you chose to join the Navy over the other careers available?	(13)
I find that my values and Navy values are very similar	(14)
Navy membership has a great deal of personal meaning for me	(15)
How strong is your sense of obligation to the Navy?	(16)
This scale is unifactorial with a reliability coefficient (alpha) of .84	

The above instrument was constructed to test the role of organizational commitment amongst RAN officers. A description of the construct is covered in Mowday et al (1982). Broadly speaking, it describes the proclivity possessed by a member of an organization by which he identifies with it to the extent that he views the goals and aims of the organization as HIS goals and aims, its values as HIS values and, figuratively speaking, its existence as HIS existence. Associated with these feelings are a desire to continue to maintain contact with the organization and to repudiate membership of other organizations.

The first three items were generated by the present writer. The "careers available" item was designed to substantiate the choice for a Navy career over alternatives. The "career to date" item establishes a direct link between the satisfaction and the commitment constructs.

The "values" item is modified from the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCL; Mowday et al, 1982). The "personal meaning" item was designed to allow for the expression of broader emotional feelings, (affective commitment) whilst the "obligation" item gives expression to the feeling that one "ought" to remain serving as a duty, out of allegiance or loyalty.

The Affective Commitment (K) Scale comprises the following items from the Retention Questionnaire.

Section & item

1. How do you feel about making the Navy your career? (S4Q4)
2. I find that my values and Navy values are very similar. (S4Q14)
3. Navy membership has a great deal of personal meaning for me. (S4Q15)
4. How strong is your sense of obligation to the Navy? (S4Q16)

The K. Scale which purports to isolate the emotional component of commitment is unifactorial and has a reliability coefficient (alpha) of .81.

COMMITMENT - IDENTIFICATION - SATISFACTION

Organizational commitment is a construct which seems co-dimensional with another, older one, that of identification with the organization. In fact, in Mowday et al. (ibid.) the two terms are sometimes used interchangeably.

In a Defence Force with its characteristic all-embracing responsibility for most significant aspects of a member's life and welfare the concept of individual commitment (or identification) seems especially pertinent when evaluating retention/turnover/attrition and attempts at predicting these. This supposition appears strengthened by contemplating, for one, the longer training and more intense indoctrination period characteristic of military employment conditions compared with those conditions of employment in most civilian organizations.

Identification (commitment) has been shown to be associated with assimilation to the Army (Salas, 1967a) and assimilation status has in turn been significantly linked to retention over a three-year term.*

In the model used in the study, (ibid) the thesis that a certain prior level of satisfaction with other-rank Army life was a prerequisite of attaining a measure of identification (commitment) with the organization was supported.

In the present study of Navy officer retention, both the satisfaction and commitment (identification) constructs were found to be very highly significantly correlated from a moderate to high degree.

Three SQ items are found in the 9 item Resignation Propensity (RP) scale. The RP Scale, the conceptual reverse of the Career Motivation scale, has been found to be a valid predictor of RAN male, officer resignation activity. (Salas, 1988b).

THE SATISFACTION SCALE QUESTIONNAIRE (SQ)

A ten-item adaptation of a 14 item scale of satisfaction with Army life (Salas, 1967b) was included in the Retention survey.

* unpublished follow-up study of results in Salas (1967a).

The SQ is a well documented scale, the results of which have been shown to be implicated in the separation and the re-engagement decisions of other - rank personnel. (Salas, 1984).

The SQ items used in the Retention Study are listed below:

1. How well do you think the Navy is run?
Very well 7 6 5 4 3 3 2 1 Very badly
2. What sort of chance does the Navy give you to show what you can do?
A very good chance 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 A very poor chance
3. In general, how do you feel about life in the Navy?
Very satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very dissatisfied
4. How do you feel about making the Navy your career?
Very keen to 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Don't want to
5. How do you feel about your chances of promotion in the Navy?
Satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Dissatisfied
6. Do you feel in general that you are doing better in the Navy than you could in civilian life?
Very much better 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very much worse
7. Do you think you have improved and bettered yourself by being in the Navy?
Very much so 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all
8. How satisfied are you with your Navy pay?
Very satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very dissatisfied
9. How do you feel with your current Navy job?
Very satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very dissatisfied

10. Men and women coming into the Navy expect things from their future Navy life. How well would you say that your expectations have been met?

Much better than expected 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Much worse than expected

The present version of the SQ does not cover the possible universe of content. Satisfaction with supervision is one important omission. Intention to re-engage, a potent item in reflecting general satisfaction in the other rank version of the SQ, was excluded as being inappropriate in the officer setting.

Items 1, 2 and 3 ("In general, how do you feel about life in the Service?"), has a history. This item first saw the light of day in Australia as part of the Satisfaction Scale Questionnaire (Salas, 1967a). It originally appeared in "The American Soldier" (Stouffer et al, 1949) as part of a Guttman scale of satisfaction with Army life.

The SQ has 2 factors with a reliability coefficient (alpha) of .82. With item 8 (pay) removed the SQ becomes unifactorial.

OTHER SCALES

The most important of these in the present context would be the Resignation Propensity (RP) Scale and the SQ, a measure of satisfaction with Navy life in the Retention Survey.

* Stouffer, S.A., Suchman, E.A., De Vinney, L.C., Star, S.A. and Williams, R.M. The American Soldier Voll Adjustment during Army Life: Princeton, N.J. Princeton Univer. Press, 1949.

The Resignation Propensity Scale (RP)

This is described at length in Salas (1988a, b). It is a nine item measure, scores on which provide an index of an officer's tendency towards voluntary separation from the Navy.

R.P. Scale

Instruction: You are invited to answer some or all of the questions below, if you wish.

1. How do you feel about your chances of promotion in the Navy?
Satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Dissatisfied
2. Do you feel in general that you are doing better in the Navy than you could in civilian life?
Very much better 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very much worse
3. How do you feel about making the Navy your career?
Very keen to 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Don't want to
4. At present, how committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy Career?
Very committed 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not committed at all
5. How attractive does the idea of career employment in civilian life appear to you at present?
Very attractive 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very unattractive
6. Have you had one or more job offers from organizations or individuals outside the Service over the past 2 years?
No.....1
Yes, one.....2
Yes, 2 or 3.....3
Yes, more than 3....4

8. Have you ever considered resigning?

Yes.....1

No.....2

9. If you answered Yes to the above item 8, please give an estimated time frame in which your contemplated resigning is most likely to be implemented.

0-2 mths.....1 3-6 mths.....2 7-12 mths.....3

13-18.....4 19-30mths.....5 30 + mths.....6

Not Applicable.....7

Three factors were identified in the RP Scale. It has a reliability coefficient alpha of .72.

The Job Satisfaction Scale (JOBSAT)

This measure comprised the following items, all from Section 4 of the Retention Survey Questionnaire.

What sort of chance does the Navy give you to show what you can do? (S4 item 2)

In general, how do you feel about life in the Navy? (S4 item 3; This item also appears in Jans' Career Motivation Scale).

How do you feel about your current Navy Job? (S4 item 9).

At present, how committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy career? (commitment Scale, CS) (S4, item 11)

How satisfied are you with your Navy career to date?

(Commitment Scale, CS) (S4, item 13)

The JOBSAT Scale is unifactorial with a reliability coefficient alpha of 0.79.

The Service Effectiveness (SE) Scale.

This measures attitudes towards the efficiency of the Navy as an employer. It includes opinions about career management,.

SE scale items are as follows: (The origin of each item is given in parentheses.)

How well do you think the Navy is run? (S4 item 1)

What sort of chance does the Navy give you to show what you can do? (S4 item 2)

In general, how satisfied do you feel with Navy life? (S4 item 3)

How satisfied are you with the current RAN Officer Personal Reporting System? (Section 2, item 8)

How satisfied are you with the quality of RAN Personnel management (including officer Career Planning)? (Section 2, item 9)

How effective do you think is the dream sheet system? (Section 2, item 10)

The SE Scale is unifactorial with a reliability coefficient (alpha) of 0.79.

The Remuneration Scale (RS)

This instrument scales attitudes towards service and civilian pay and the financial costs of being a member of the Navy. The RS is made up of the following items. Origins of items are given in parentheses.

How satisfied are you with your Navy pay? (S4 item 8)

How does your Navy pay (+ allowances, benefits etc) compare with the money you think you could expect to receive in civilian life? (Section 3, item 15).

Financial costs of being in RAN (e.g. removals) - (as a resignation influence; Section 5, item 17)

The R. Scale is unifactorial and has a reliability coefficient alpha of 0.65.

The Career Prospects Scale (CP)

This device measures officers' attitudes towards their future Naval career. The scale is made up of the following items from the Retention Survey questionnaire.

1. Officers have expressed the observation that there are comparatively few billets at future rank levels which have much interest in them. This implies posting an officer to positions for which he/she is not a volunteer. How does, or will, this situation apply to you?
2. How satisfied are you with the quality of the RAN personnel management (including officer Career Planning?) (Section 2, item 9)
3. How do you feel about your chances of promotion in the Navy? (Section 4, item 5)
4. At present how committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy career? (Section 4, item 11)
5. Unattractiveness of likely future posting locations or job (as a resignation influence) Section 5, item 10)

This scale proved to be bi-factorial with a coefficient alpha of 0.62.

Note

The Career Prospects Scale was excluded from earlier analyses when it was discovered that item 5 from Section 4 of the questionnaire (promotion chances) had been omitted from it.

Promotion prospects are integral to the assessment of future career prospects, at some stages perhaps more than at others. (three of the nine items used by Jans (1988) in his career prospects scale alluded to "promotion".)

JOBEST

This consists of one item which scales an officer's perception of the degree of availability to him of civilian employment. It reads as follows.

"At present how certain do you feel that you could get satisfactory employment in civilian life without much trouble?" (Section 3, item 8)